

From: [ANDERSON Jim M](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [MCCLINCY Matt](#); [GAINER Tom](#); [POULSEN Mike](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
Subject: LWG's 8/07 "Erosion Core FSP Tech Approach"
Date: 10/05/2007 02:33 PM

Eric & Chip,

Here are DEQ's comments on the LWG's 8/29/07 "*Erosion Core Sediment Evaluation & FSP Technical Approach*".

General Comment

1) DEQ agrees with LWG's overall approach presented in this document, & LWG's plan that this Erosion Core (EC) FSP is only one piece in the overall comprehensive RD 3B sediment FSP to be submitted later. The EC FSP lays out a clear objective & strategy for identifying proposed core locations based potential scour, elevated subsurface contamination, un-sampled historic releases, & large areas where subsurface sediment have not been sampled. The FSP closely follows the strategy identifying proposed core locations.

Specific Comments

1) EC6- We agree that an EC should be advanced to bound contamination at iAOPC 16 (Triangle Park), but suggest moving the location slightly downstream near the edge of the erosional cell to better capture potential contamination from the nearshore moved down-current.

2) EC10- We agree that an EC should be advanced to better bound As contamination between iAOPCs 20 & 21, but suggest moving the location slightly (100-200') downstream away from the existing core to get better spatial coverage.

3) EC12- We agree that an EC should be advanced to better bound PCB contamination at iAOPC 24 & because of the low density of cores (Section 3.3 criterion), but suggest moving the location closer (300-500') to iAOPC 24.

4) EC26- We agree that an EC should be advanced in this area because of the low density of cores (Section 3.3 criterion) & to better bound contamination at iAOPC 18, but suggest moving it closer to iAOPC 18 & further downstream (150-250' towards the downstream/channel-ward corner of iAOPC 18 off the Hampton Lumber dock).

5) EC28- The LWG's didn't identify the need for an EC based on Section 3.3 criterion (low density areas identified with Theissen polygons) in the vicinity of RM 4.5 channel area. However, it's clear that there isn't much subsurface information in this erosional area. We suggest an additional EC near the center of the channel area off Wheeler Bay (RM 4.5).

James M. Anderson
Manager, Portland Harbor Section
DEQ NWR
Phone (503) 229-6825
Cell (971) 563-1434
Fax (503) 229-6899